

AIR POUCH

PRIORITY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

A/CDC/MR

DO NOT TYPE IN THIS SPACE

FOREIGN SERVICE DESPATCH

DATE

FROM: American Embassy HELSINKI

TO: THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON

REF: EmbDes 98, August 7

August 12, 1959

|                                 |       |                     |               |
|---------------------------------|-------|---------------------|---------------|
| ACTION<br>For Dept.<br>Use Only | REC'D | DEPT.<br>I N<br>F O | OTHER<br>C.A. |
|                                 | 8/17  | R.M.                | U.A.          |

SUBJECT: Continuing Public Debate on Finland's Relations with USSR

00B.1 US.A-10

In addition to lively discussion in the press and public speeches of the subject of possible reorganization of the Finnish Government (see EmbDes 101), recent days have also seen a revival of statements on Finnish foreign policy. Two of these are worth noting, even though they have not yet brought forth reactions from those who might possibly dispute their accuracy.

Less controversial of the two was probably the statement of Miss Irma Karvikko, Liberal Party Information Officer and former Diet Member, who spoke to a party meeting on August 9, in part as follows:

"In the field of foreign policy the duty of the Liberal Party is to follow a realistic Finnish line. It is in vain to argue, as has recently been done in many quarters, on how the Paasikivi line must be interpreted. It was his personal line. But let us take a realistic attitude towards the present situation, let us put our feelings on the shelf and examine honestly and without emotion what sort of a line and attitude is in harmony with Finland's interests. What does this realism mean in practice? It means that ideological differences of opinion must not disturb our neighborly relations, and that, on the other hand, these neighborly relations must not have an influence on the ideological view of the world of either party concerned."

This use of the term "realistic" to characterize Finland's foreign policy would not necessarily be disputed by Dr. Tuure Junnula, Conservative Diet Member, who the same day condemned much more strongly ~~the~~ the "realism" that deludes itself by thinking "that a small nation can safeguard its sovereignty . . . by surrendering it bit by bit." Junnula was speaking to a group of university youth, and made foreign policy the second point in an otherwise non-political speech.

Without specifically identifying his targets, Junnula made clear that he was aiming at President Kekkonen and the official line, by saying that this kind of "realism" is promoted by "hazy societies and associations" and "certain questionable papers." The former reference includes at least the Paasikivi Society, in which some of Junnula's Conservative colleagues are represented, while the latter applies most obviously to PAIVAN SANOMAT, organ of the SD

GCHilliker:ln

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

REPORTER

ACTION COPY — DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The action office must return this permanent record copy to DC/R files with an endorsement of action taken.

660E.61/8-1259 EMM

HN  
B  
DET  
165  
5

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Page 2 of

Encl. No.

Disp. No. 106  
From Helsinki

Opposition. At the same time as he vigorously criticized these circles, Junnila took care to point out that he was not championing any chauvinistic return to the pre-war atmosphere in which another kind of self-delusion was practiced. Translation of an excerpt from his speech is enclosed.

For the Ambassador:

*Grant G. Hilliker*

Grant G. Hilliker  
First Secretary of Embassy

*att*  
Enclosure:

Excerpt from speech by  
Dr. Tuure Junnila, HS,  
August 10, 1959.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

UNCLASSIFIED

Page 1 of

Encl. No. 1

Desp. No. 106

From Helsinki

HELSINGIN SANOMAT

August 10, 1959

(Latter half of speech)

Dr. Tuure Junnila:

But at the same time the students of today have another, already traditional duty of national revival always to discharge. In Finland, as well as in many other countries, the students have been supporters and pioneers of freedom. Today this duty is at least as vitally important as ever before. Individual and national freedom are both preconditions without which a tolerable life is not possible. At the same time they are linked together in the sense that, particularly in our conditions, the former cannot be thought of if the latter is lost. Constant united efforts are necessary to preserve them both.

In this connection there is every reason to note that today there does not seem to be any danger to the mental balance of our society in the form of the fanatical and heedless national jingoism of which the students have been criticized, sometimes with reason. Our national life, at least our public life, seems to have lost that feature altogether.

Today the mental sanity of our society is endangered by a swing in a totally opposite direction. I mean that trend of thought which very willingly, but quite wrongly, calls itself "realism", and which deceives itself and others by imagining that a small nation can safeguard its sovereignty in the best way by being prepared, in the face of pressure, to surrender it bit by bit. This attitude of surrender is justified by explaining that it takes place in unessential points of secondary importance. Yet, small breaches easily develop into dangerous cracks. Accordingly an attitude like this will very easily mean a fatal bargaining with the nation's freedom of decision, i.e. its independence.

This sort of "realism" is, however, nowadays offered to people by various hazy societies and associations, as well as by certain questionable papers, concerning which it is not even known in which country's currency the high costs of them are paid.

We need, of course, very badly real realism: an absolute respect for facts - particularly also the unpleasant ones - a sane sense of proportion and a constant mental rejection of self-deceit and fancies. But if anything is realism - realism proved true by historical experiences in innumerable different connections - it is to keep perpetually in mind that especially such a small, solitary nation as the Finns, living among a mass of almost three billion people, cannot attain or preserve its independence by any other means than by being always prepared to sacrifice, endure and fight

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

Page 2 of

Encl. No. 1 106

Des. No. 106  
From: ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ Helsinki

for it. It is true that it would be much more pleasant to believe that to preserve one's freedom nothing is required but diplomatic flexibility and skill, repeated assurances of one's honest aims, and to pretend innocence towards all quarters. This is a pleasant, but everything but a realistic, fancy. It is deplorable that struggle and great sacrifices seem to be always the price of freedom.

To avoid misinterpretations it is necessary to state immediately that, thank God, in this case the campaign need not mean the clash of arms, the smoke of gunpowder or the customary sacrifice of youngsters on battlefields. What we now need most is "civilian bravery", which carefully avoids vain threats, but is decisively prepared to stick to the basic rights of a small nation even in the face of political and economic pressure. This does not harm any outsider, but on the other hand it is a necessary precondition for any nation's richer, more varied and happier national life.

In this disgusting world in which force, injustice and oppression of nations flourish even today, even one's preparedness to sacrifice and fight does not always guarantee the preservation of the sovereignty of a small nation, and not always that of even a bigger one. But together with necessary political tact and consideration these characteristics guarantee, in any case, the independence and freedom of a nation better than the philosophy of selling freedom piecemeal, which we are at present being offered by different quarters under the name of realism, which is actually/completely wrong name for it.

Instinct will advise a Finnish student not to lend an ear to these siren songs of self-deceit, and in certain cases of real deceit. Even today, one of the national duties of young students is, according to their traditions, to act as standardbearers and pioneers of the idea of true and genuine freedom.

Translated by: A. Nopsanen

UNCLASSIFIED